

Bellovin 113031

#### REMARKS

Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Williams, US Patent 6,304,973. Claim 29 was rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Shwed, US Patent 5,606,668.

Theses rejections are a "cut and paste" copy of the rejections in the first Office action-- even though the set of presented claims is different. Consequently, deleted claims stand rejected, and newly added claims apparently were not examined.

The Examiner did, however, present a rebuttal to applicant's arguments. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, traverses the rebuttal, and respectfully requests that the Finality of the instant action be withdrawn for failure to examine all of the presented claims. Taking this opportunity, however, a number of the claims are amended to make the claims' limitations clearer.

Applicant wishes to point out that in the very rebuttal of the Examiner one finds the differences between the claimed subject matter and the subject matter taught by Williams. Specifically, as argued by the Examiner, the NSC in the Williams reference "is a dedicated machine that is responsible for both authenticating principals when they connect to the network and for authorizing connections." However, authenticating a user is not the same as authenticating a packet. In the instant claims, a *packet* is authenticated, and as defined in claim 1, the packet is examined to determine the authenticity of the packet's source. No such authentications take place in the Williams reference.

Further, while it is true that col. 15, lines 40-57 of the Williams reference teach about enforcing a policy relative to hardware addresses and IP addresses, it remains that the IP address of the arriving packet in the Williams reference is not assured to be *bona fide* and, therefore, a policy that says, for example, that a packet from IP address A may not be sent to an IP address B is easily circumvented by spoofing. This cannot happen in applicant's defined method and apparatus, where the packet's source host is verified.

As for the "common host identifier" argument of the Examiner, it is respectfully noted that amended (independent) claims 1 and 11 speak in terms of "encrypted identifier for verifying identity of a first device that sent said packet." Claim 21 specifies an "encrypted common host identifier for verifying identity of a first device that sent said packet via a decryption process, while remainder of said packet unencrypted" (emphasis

Bellovin 113031

supplied). In contradistinction, all that the Examiner points to is the IP address of packets.

Because the Examiner failed to examine newly added claims 30 and 31, it is respectfully submitted that the finality of the instant action must be withdrawn.

Further, because the outstanding claims are directed to authenticating the source of received packets, in contradistinction to the Williams reference that does no such authenticating, it is respectfully submitted that the outstanding claims are patentable over the Williams reference, and over the combination of the Williams and Shwed references. Hence, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby solicited.

Respectfully,  
Steven M. Bellovin

Dated: 11/11/03

By Henry T. Brendzel  
Henry T. Brendzel  
Reg. No. 26,844  
Phone (973) 467-2025  
Fax (973) 467-6589  
email [brendzel@comcast.net](mailto:brendzel@comcast.net)